

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Bachmann et al.	\$ Group Art Unit: 2172
	\$
Serial No.: 09/303,356	\$ Examiner: Nguyen, T.
	\$
Filed: 04/29/1999	\$ Atty. Docket No.: AT9-98-955
	\$
For: Method for deferred	\$
deletion of entries for a	\$
directory server backing store	\$

INFORMAL COMMUNICATION

Examiner Nguyen:

I would like to request a telephonic interview, particularly to discuss the pending 103(a) rejection in the above-noted application. The main point that I would like to discuss is that Kennedy (USP 6134582) was applied as a reference in the previous Office action, and Applicant responded to the previous rejections with several arguments against the use of Kennedy for these claims. However, most of these arguments have been ignored. The primary argument about the structure and logic of the rejection and the combination of Kennedy with Byrne et al. has resulted in the withdrawal of the previous rejection, but the Office action stated that "Applicant's arguments ... were moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection." Applicant disagrees, and several of the arguments in the previous response are still relevant.


As an initial point, Kennedy does not mention a directory or a directory service, so it is not possible for Kennedy to disclose the element of "tagging the directory entry in a first table" as recited in the first element of independent claim 1. This argument has not been addressed in the current Office action, and the feature of directory entries in the claim has not been addressed in the current rejections.

Moreover, Applicant provided several arguments in support of the subject matter in the dependent claims, which were rejected mostly in view of Kennedy. Applicant argued extensively that Kennedy did not disclose the claimed features. However, the rejections of these claims have not been changed, and the Office action did not provide any argument as to why the examiner disagreed with Applicant's arguments. In other words, these arguments have been ignored and dismissed as moot, yet the rejection of the claims has remained the same (except for the changed basis for rejecting their independent claims). It is unclear why at least a minimal amount of commentary was not provided in the current Office action as to why there may be a disagreement on the content of Applicant's arguments.

I look forward to discussing this matter with you.

DATE: March 4, 2003

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph R. Burwell, Reg. No. 44,468
Voice: 866-728-3688 (866-PATENT8)
Fax: 866-728-3680 (866-PATENT0)
Email: joe@burwell.biz